

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—May I know whether prior permission of the Magistrate was obtained before firing?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—At the time of the incident, it is not necessary to open fire with the previous permission or consent of the Magistrate. When the situation was beyond the control of the officers who were in charge and when self-defence was a necessity and also in case of defence of the property of the private persons it is not necessary to run to the Magistrate. But, at the same time the Magistrate was also called on the spot.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Is it not a fact that in causing injury to a woman the intention of the police was to kill her?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It cannot be asserted like that. There is no intention on the part of the police to cause such an injury to a woman, so as to cause death.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Was there any death amongst the police officers to justify police action?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—To justify such an action, there is no necessity that the police should die first.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Have Government thought of paying compensation to the persons injured?

(No answer.)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—On 22nd and 23rd, when the firing took place, was the Home Minister present in Bangalore, or at least whether the occurrence of the incident was brought to his notice?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—This is on 23rd. I will ascertain and tell my Hon'ble friend.

Appointment of the Advocate General

3.—**Sri L. SRIKANTIAH** (Nanjangud).—

Will the Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs be pleased to state:—

(a) whether there has been a fresh appointment to the post of the Advocate-General in Mysore and if so, the name of the incumbent and his standing in the Bar;

(b) on whose recommendation this fresh appointment was made?

A.—Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs).—

(a) Yes; Sri V. S. Malimath, LL.B., D.I.L. (Lond.), Advocate, Bangalore, has been appointed Advocate-General on 17th February 1968. He has 16 years standing at the Bar.